

REMARKS

Claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,103 to Fernandez *et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "Fernandez"). Claims 3-10 and 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Fernandez reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,137,485 to Kawai *et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "Kawai"). Finally, Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Fernandez reference in view of Kawai and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,915 to Ozaki *et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "Ozaki"). Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice, rendering the Examiner's rejection of this claim moot. New Claims 18 -21 are added without introducing any new subject matter. Therefore, Claims 1-9 and 11-21 are pending in the present patent application. The Examiner's rejections of the pending claims are respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to the abstract and the specification of the patent application stands objected for various informalities. In addition, the Examiner objected to Claims 4, 10, 14, and 16 because of some informalities. By this amendment, the abstract and the specification are appropriately corrected without adding any new subject matter. Moreover, Claims 4, 14 and 16 are amended without introducing new subject matter.

Specifically, claim 1 calls for a method of controlling the surveillance of an area with a mobile terminal. The method of Claim 1 includes receiving a request for surveillance from the mobile terminal, identifying the area that is to be under surveillance, and orienting equipment to effect surveillance of the identified area. For example, as defined in the specification, on page 2,

line 15, a mobile terminal subscriber may seize control of a direct surveillance equipment to focus in on an identified area. Thereafter, the mobile terminal subscriber may initiate the surveillance process. For example, the area placed under surveillance may be the location of the subscribers' mobile terminal or a remote area identified by the subscriber. Based on the location of the mobile terminal and the surveillance equipment, an orientation of a video surveillance camera may be determined. See the Applicants' patent application, page 6, lines 30-33.

In contrast, the Fernandez reference describes an integrated network for monitoring remote objects in which a corroborative surveillance of a given object is enabled by a controller. The controller described by Fernandez monitors positional data associated with a mobile position of such given object and visual data associated with a visible observation of such given object. A user monitoring the controller may communicate with a cellular telephone which generates the positional data during the corroborative surveillance. See the Fernandez reference, Col. 21, lines 20-38.

However, the Fernandez reference does not describe controlling the surveillance of an area with a mobile terminal (as defined in the present application). A request for surveillance does not appear to be received from the mobile terminal. For electronically monitoring remote object, the mobile terminal neither identifies the area that is to be under surveillance nor orients equipment to effect surveillance of the identified area in the integrated system described by Fernandez. The electronic monitoring of remote objects described in the Fernandez reference, as cited by the Examiner, refers to a controller effectively enabling monitoring of remote objects. That is, the Fernandez reference teaches that a controller user may provide input to specify or

request current or future monitoring or surveillance of one or more certain location (*i.e.*, associated fixed detector site) or object (*i.e.*, associated mobile target unit site).

Thus, the corroborative surveillance of a given object is not controlled by a mobile terminal from which a request for surveillance is received since the controller user specifies or requests monitoring of the remote object. See the Fernandez reference, Col. 6, lines 59-63.

Therefore, the Applicants' respectfully submit that the electronic monitoring of remote objects using an integrated system described by the Fernandez reference is not controlled by a mobile terminal that generates a request for surveillance. For at least this reason alone, Applicants' respectfully request that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Fernandez reference and request the Examiner to reconsider the §102 rejection thereof since Claim 1 is in condition for allowance in view of the cited art of record. Because Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art, Claim 2 depending therefrom is also deemed patentable.

Claims 3-10, 12-17 stand rejected under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Fernandez reference in view of the Kawai reference. The Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not rendered obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the pertinent art in view of the Fernandez and Kawai references, considered either alone or in combination. That is, a *prima facie* case of obviousness is absent since these references fail to teach or suggest all the recited features. Specifically, as set forth above, the Fernandez reference fails to teach or suggest control of surveillance of an area with a mobile terminal, as claimed in independent Claim 1. The Examiner relies on the Kawai reference to teach use of information from at least one base station to identify the area that is to be under surveillance. However, the Kawai reference fails to teach or suggest a surveillance control of an area with a mobile terminal. The Examiner relies on the


Ozaki reference to teach that a person at the mobile terminal is in audio communication via a wireless network with an attendant at a video monitor. However, the Ozaki reference fails to teach or suggest controlling the surveillance of an area with a mobile terminal based on a request for surveillance from the mobile terminal.

Furthermore, the cited references fail to provide any suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings to arrive at the Applicants' claimed invention. Instead, as indicated above, the Fernandez reference teaches an integrated system for monitoring remote objects that uses a controller to control a corroborative surveillance of an object based on positional data and visual data. In fact, the Fernandez reference teaches away from a video surveillance system in which a mobile terminal controls the surveillance of an area and issues a request for surveillance. Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the claimed invention will not result from the cited references because the cited references fail to provide any suggestion or motivation for controlling the surveillance of an area with a mobile terminal.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not *prima facie* obvious in view of the cited references. Applicants request that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 3-9, 11-17 be withdrawn. The new added Claims 18-21 are also considered novel and unobvious in view of the cited art of record for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider all the pending claims.

In view of these amendments and remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4052 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Date: <u>11/15/04</u>	<p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>WILLIAMS, MORGAN &amp; AMERSON, P.C. CUSTOMER NO. 46290</p> <p>By: <u></u></p> <p>Mark W. Sincek, Reg. 52,226 10333 Richmond, Suite 1100 Houston, Texas 77042 (713) 934-7000 (713) 934-7011 (facsimile) AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)</p>
-----------------------	--

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_**

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**